

REMARKS

Within the Office Action dated 24 September 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 9-10 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C section 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 7,089,321 B2 to Hayashi (Hayashi) in view of United States Patent Application 2004/0,268,407 to Sparrell (Sparrell).

Claims 3 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Sparrell and United States Patent Application 2007/0,199,030 to Ellis et al. (Ellis).

Claims 4 and 12 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell and United States Patent Application 2004/0,221,302 to Ansari (Ansari).

Claims 5-8 and 13-16 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell and United States Patent Application 2006/0179462 to Willame (Willame).

Claim 21 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Sparrell and "Automatic Windows 98/ME TCP/IP Addressing Without a DHCP Server" (APIPA).

By this response Applicants do not add, amend, or cancel any claims. Accordingly, claims 1-21 will be pending in the application upon entry of this response.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-8

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2 under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell. Claim 3 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Sparrell and Ellis. Claim 4 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Sparrell and Ansari. Claims 5-8 were rejected under

MACV.P0011

section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell and Willame. Claims 2-8 are dependent on claim 1.

Claim 1 recites a method for networking several clients in a personal video recording ("PVR") system. The method receives several television signals and tunes each of the television signals in one of several tuners. The method buffers the television signals on a storage medium in at least one PVR media server. The method couples several clients, over a network, to the PVR media server. The method receives at least one request from each of at least two clients for at least one service in the PVR system, and allocates resources of the PVR system to the clients, as appropriate, to deliver the service to the clients. The method designates one of at least three states to a first tuner. The at least three states comprise at least: a busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state. The states are used to allocate tuners to the requesting clients. The resources of the PVR system include the tuners. The first tuner comprises a first designated state.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Hayashi and Sparrell do not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a method. Sparrell at paragraph [0064] describes network resources are needed to construct a media pipeline, and disk space is needed for recording. Sparrell's tuners are described as either used or not used. At paragraph [0077], Sparrell's tuner is identified as a network resource that has previously been reserved that "Dad" could request to steal from one of the other media pipelines. Hence, Sparrell at these paragraphs [0064 and 0077] does not disclose, teach, or even suggest designating one of at least three states to a first tuner where the three states include at least a busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state, and the first tuner comprises a first designated state. Moreover, neither Hayashi nor Sparrell disclose, teach, or even suggest "designating" the at least three states to the first tuner. Applicants

MACV.P0011

respectfully submit that the designating the one of the at least three states to the tuner is distinct from "assigning" the tuner, which is separately recited in the claims to further emphasize the distinction.

Accordingly, the cited references do not render unpatentable claim 1. Since claims 2-8 are dependent on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render unpatentable claims 2-8 for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8.

II. Rejection of Claims 9-16

Claims 9-10 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell. Claim 11 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi, in view of Sparrell and Ellis. Claim 12 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell and Ansari. Claims 13-16 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell and Willame. Claims 10-16 are dependent on claim 9.

Claim 9 recites a personal video recording ("PVR") media server comprising an input for receiving several television signals, several tuners, a storage medium, and a network interface. The tuners are for tuning each of the television signals, and the storage medium is for buffering the television signals. The network interface is for coupling several clients, over a network, to the PVR media server. The PVR media server is for receiving at least one request from each of at least two clients for at least one service of a PVR system, and for allocating resources of the PVR system to the clients, as appropriate, to deliver the service to the clients. The server designates one of at least three states to a first tuner. The at least three states comprise at least: a

MACV.P0011

busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state. The states are used to allocate tuners to the requesting clients. The resources of the PVR system include the tuners. The first tuner comprises a first designated state.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Hayashi and Sparrell do not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a method. Sparrell at paragraph [0064] describes network resources are needed to construct a media pipeline, and disk space is needed for recording. Sparrell's tuners are described as either used or not used. At paragraph [0077], Sparrell's tuner is identified as a network resource that has previously been reserved that "Dad" could request to steal from one of the other media pipelines. Hence, Sparrell at these paragraphs [0064 and 0077] does not disclose, teach, or even suggest designating one of at least three states to a first tuner where the three states include at least a busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state, and the first tuner comprises a first designated state. Moreover, neither Hayashi nor Sparrell disclose, teach, or even suggest "designating" the at least three states to the first tuner. Applicants respectfully submit that the designating the one of the at least three states to the tuner is distinct from "assigning" the tuner, which is separately recited in the claims to further emphasize the distinction.

Accordingly, the cited references do not render unpatentable claim 9. Since claims 10-16 are dependent on claim 9, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render unpatentable claims 10-16 for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 9. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-16.

III. Rejection of Claim 17

Claims 17-20 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in

MACV.P0011

view of Sparrell. Claim 21 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Sparrell and APIPA. Claims 18-21 are dependent on Claim 17.

Claim 17 recites a personal video recording ("PVR") system comprising at least one PVR media server, a network, and several clients. The PVR media server has an input for receiving several television signals, several tuners for tuning each of the television signals, and a storage medium for buffering the television signals. The clients are coupled over the network to the PVR media server. The PVR media server is configured for receiving at least one request from each of at least two clients for at least one service in the PVR system, and for allocating resources of the PVR system to the clients, as appropriate, to deliver the service to the clients. The system designates one of at least three states to a first tuner. The at least three states comprise at least: a busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state. The states are used to allocate tuners to the requesting clients. The resources of the PVR system include the tuners. The first tuner comprises a first designated state.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Hayashi and Sparrell do not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a method. Sparrell at paragraph [0064] describes network resources are needed to construct a media pipeline, and disk space is needed for recording. Sparrell's tuners are described as either used or not used. At paragraph [0077], Sparrell's tuner is identified as a network resource that has previously been reserved that "Dad" could request to steal from one of the other media pipelines. Hence, Sparrell at these paragraphs [0064 and 0077] does not disclose, teach, or even suggest designating one of at least three states to a first tuner where the three states include at least a busy state, a maybe free state, and a totally free state, and the first tuner comprises a first designated state. Moreover, neither Hayashi nor Sparrell disclose, teach, or even suggest "designating" the at least three states to the first tuner. Applicants

MACV.P0011

respectfully submit that the designating the one of the at least three states to the tuner is distinct from "assigning" the tuner, which is separately recited in the claims to further emphasize the distinction.

Accordingly, the cited references do not render unpatentable claim 17. Since claims 18-21 are dependent on claim 17, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not invalidate these claims for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 17. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that the claims, namely claims 1-21, are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below.

If any fees are required, please charge the required fees to Deposit Account No. 13-0762.

Respectfully submitted,

MACROVISION SOLUTIONS INC.

Dated: November 20, 2008

/Andy Pho/ #48,862

Andy T. Pho

Reg. No. 48,862

MACROVISION SOLUTIONS INC.

2830 De La Cruz Blvd.

Santa Clara, CA 95050

Phone: (408) 562 8435

Fax: (408) 567 1800

MACV.P0011